



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,226	12/13/2001	Matthias Stefan Bierbrauer	DE920000116US1	6251
7590	05/02/2005		EXAMINER	
Jeffrey S. LaBaw International Business Machines Intellectual Property Law 11400 Burnett Road Austin, TX 78758			HEWITT II, CALVIN L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	
DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/015,226	BIERBRAUER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Calvin L Hewitt II	3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 33-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 33-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Status of Claims***

1. Claims 1 and 33-52 have been examined.

***Response to Amendments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 33-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 33-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beattie et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,659,742, in view of Nazem et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227 and Schreiber et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,298,446.

As per claims 1 and 33-52, Beattie et al. teach a method for handling content off-loading from a document processing system where the system

receives a document and removes content from a document, wherein the content is the whole document or at least part of the document (figure 1). Beattie et al. doesn't specifically recite receiving digital documents. However, *In re Venner* (*In re Venner and Bowser*, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958)) is clear,

it is well settled that it is not "invention" to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result. *In re Rundell*, 18 CCPA 1290, 48 F.2d 958, 9 USPQ 220

Therefore, it would have been obvious to deliver content to the maintainers of the Beattie et al system in digital form to eliminate conversion costs. Beattie et al. also transfer extracted content to a remote document repository (figures 1 and 3), replace the extracted content with a URL link placeholder (figures 4A-C; column 11, lines 60-65), in response to a search query performing a search of the repository (figures 4A-C; column 12, lines 15-45), returns a hitlist containing results (e.g. digital content and one or more items of additional content from said repository) of said search (figure 4A), displays selectable elements for retrieving said digital content associated with said hit (figure 4A), stores the URL link placeholder in a data structure (figure 4A) and displays a button representing the URL link placeholder for viewing said content associated with said hit (figure 4A). However, Beattie et al. do not specifically recite a URL with encrypted identifier, time stamp and user identifier (i.e. user who initiated extraction of content). Nazem et al. teach a method for replacing content with an URL identifier comprising a time stamp and user identifier (i.e. user who initiated extraction of

content) (figures 5A and B; column 15, lines 45-67), while Schreiber et al. teach replacing content with an encrypted identifier (i.e. disguising references to protected content using aliases that map back to an IP address) (column 20, lines 5-21; column 21, lines 29-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Beattie et al., Nazem et al. and Schreiber et al. in order to more efficiently present content to users ('227, abstract) and prevent users from having unfettered access to protected content ('446, abstract).

### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Art Unit: 3621

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Calvin Loyd Hewitt II whose telephone number is (703) 308-8057. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
c/o Technology Center 2100  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 (for formal communications intended for entry and after-final communications),

or:

(703) 746-5532 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5,  
2451 Crystal Drive, 7th Floor Receptionist.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application  
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)  
308-1113.

Calvin Loyd Hewitt II

April 11, 2005

JAMES P. TRAMMELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600